



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/720,483

11/25/2003

Pekka Vallitu

STICK-001-A

4364

32954 7590 03/08/2007
JAMES C. LYDON
100 DAINGERFIELD ROAD
SUITE 100
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

BUMGARNER, MELBA N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3732

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

03/08/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/720,483

Applicant(s)

VALLITTU ET AL.

Examiner

Melba Bumgarner

Art Unit

3732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 December 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karmaker et al. (6,186,790) in view of Thompson et al. (3,782,383). Karmaker et al. disclose a method for manufacturing a dental device for use in construction of a finished appliance, the device comprising a solid prefabricated body (column 5 line 37) and a shapable prepreg comprising fibers and a resinous matrix comprising a polymerizable monomer (column 4 line 14), the method comprising the step of contacting the body with the prepreg (column 6 line 2); however, they do not show the step of protecting the bottom surface of the device. Thompson et al. teach a method having the step of protecting the bottom surface of the medical device with protective tape 78. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the step of Thompson et al. in the method of Karmaker et al. in order to cover and protect the bottom surface during manufacture, transportation and preliminary use in view of Thompson et al. Karmaker et al. show surface of the solid body, which is contacted with the prepreg (column 7 line 49), has been chemically or mechanically pre-treated (column 7 line 46). The prepreg comprises a curable polymer (column 3 line 62). The prepreg comprises initiators (column 3 line 64).

3. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karmaker et al. in view of Thompson et al. and further in view of Dragan (5,676,543). Karmaker et al. and Thompson et al. disclose a method that shows the limitations as described above and the body or bodies placed in impressions made of a mold after which the prepreg and mold are pressed toward each other so that the body or bodies are pressed in the prepreg (figure 4 of Karmaker et al.); however, they do not show the material of the mold. Dragan teaches a dental method including impressions made in a mold of silicone (column 3 line 23). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the material of the mold of Dragan in order to use material that is moldable and quick to set in reproducing the shape of the tooth in view of Dragan.

4. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karmaker et al., Thompson et al. and Dragan. They disclose a method that shows the limitations as described above; however, they do not show the mold retained around the device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as to whether the device is released from or retained with the mold before use.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejected claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. It is noted that absent a clear indication in the specification or claims of what the basic and novel characteristic actually are, the phrase "consisting essentially of" used in claim 11 was construed as equivalent to "comprising". The specification uses the term "comprising" on page 4.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melba Bumgarner whose telephone number is 571-272-4709. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cris Rodriquez can be reached at 571-272-4964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3732

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Melba Bumgarner
Primary Examiner